1. From Archaeography to Photology

Lesley McFadyen and Dan Hicks

*To press the shutter release is to capture a moment in time. A photograph represents an instant witnessed through the camera lens. It's a fragment of time; a visual remnant; 'a strange stasis, the essence of a stoppage', as Roland Barthes put it (*ça-a-été*).*[i] *Before you know it, this freeze-frame begins to behave like an object. It fits into your jacket pocket, your wallet; it slips between the pages of a book. (The archivist even monitors levels of humidity, temperature and light for the stability of these mummified remains, removes steel paper clips and sticky tape.) An optical residue; this collected or preserved experience bursts into the contemporary, flashes up. To point a camera is to make some kind of punctuation. The photograph, as a retrospective image, somehow projects elements that 'rise out from the scene like an arrow and come to pierce' the viewer. It makes 'a little hole, a small clip'*[ii] *– more than just a paper-cut from the photocopier. And the analogy follows effortlessly: this optical sherd that digs into the skin of those who look into the past, this beam in the eye, is like an archaeological artefact, a mechanical trace that reproduces the near past, a present absence – and thus a conundrum of simultaneity. Such a 'photographic paradox' must surely (Barthes again) lie in the nature of its content:*

> *'What is the content of the photographic message? What does the photograph transmit? By definition, the scene itself, literal reality. From the object to its image there is certainly a reduction – in proportion, in perspective and in colour. But at no time is this reduction a transformation (in the mathematical sense of the term).*[iii]

Archaeology and Photography 'emerged at the same time and under the same interests in the modern world of the first half of the nineteenth century' (Shanks 2016). We have only to recall the earliest photographs, like Roger Fenton's 1857 'Gallery of Antiquities' at the British Museum, for example (Figure 1.1)*, to see the point. Photography and Archaeology hold in common certain concerns: with objectivity, with a detached and hegemonic modernist viewing of the world, with the visual as evidence, with the stoppage of time for the sake of the monumental. And thus, with some kind of multiplication of time wrought by these 'two devices of western modernity' (Hamilakis, Anagnostopoulos and Ifantidis 2009: 285). Archaeology and Photography: these twin machines of indexicality cast a deictic light across the contours of ruins. The archaeologist's trowel whirrs with the prosthetic gesture of a Polaroid camera, sticking out its flat palm which is a photographic print. The archaeo-photographer holds a chunk of the past in their hand and then, through some trick of reverse chiromancy, reads the vivid and inexorable detail of its unique markings – to predict the past. In these ways and more, Archaeology and Photography are united in the common endeavour of the representation of history. As if each photograph were a relic, and each pot sherd a snapshot, and each tick of the camera a snap of the clock.*

Such has been the orthodoxy with which our theme, *Archaeology and Photography*, came to be established as a trope in the archaeotheory of *fin de siècle* Representational Archaeology. It is an orthodoxy which this book aims to invert. Thinking beyond the dogma of the contemporary past, the absent present, the sheer artefactualism of a superficial symbolism, bolstered here and there through partial readings of the work of Roland Barthes, that has reduced each side of this pairing to an analogy for the other. Michael Shanks even repurposed Jim Deetz's neologism, *Archaeography*, to express the idea of some post-disciplinary hybridity in the interpretation of the past. Whereas in most areas of cultural studies during the 1980s Photography came to represent not so much a technical or cultural practice but a theoretical metaphor, in Archaeology it has come to index the methodological fetishization of the artefact as a trace (cf. Krauss 1999: 290; Dubois 2016) – a foundational analogy for the idea that Archaeology represents the past in the present. As if *Archaeology and Photography* were some version of classical reception studies for visual and material culture – as if trapped inside Fenton's *Gallery of Antiquities* forever.

This book experiments with some alternative accounts of observation and participation in Archaeology and Photography. It understands modern technologies and modes of thought as objects of archaeological enquiry, resources for the future not just hegemonies from the past (cf. Hicks and Beaudry 2006, Hicks 2016). It seeks to problematise the artefactualist-presentist assertion of the Representational Archaeology that our discipline works with mere nonhuman ruins and remnants of past moments that are received and interpreted in the symmetry of a contemporary moment (see Shanks 1992, Hamilakis 2008, Bohrer 2011, Hamilakis and Ifantidis 2013, 2016, Carabott *et al.* 2015; cf. Hicks 2003). It understands Archaeology as a visual medium, in which things are discovered and made visible, not just socially constructed or and culturally represented. Rather than reducing Archaeology and Photography to analogies to each other, collapsing one into a metaphor for the other, playing the mirror games of object and subject, of past and present as signifier and signified, we explore some of the different ways in which Archaeology and Photography can live together, and can intervene in the world.

Three main themes are at stake. In each case, we explore how to imagine alternatives to the Representational Archaeology. First, the different approaches to *Objectivity* assembled here start to question Barthes' assertion that the passage from object to image is 'at no time a transformation', imagining the human past and its material evidence as far more contingent (Hicks 2010, Hicks and Beaudry 2010). Second, the question of the *Archive* is framed not in comparative terms, where archaeological remnants are understood to be photographic in quality, but in terms of co-existence and mutual identification of these two methods where archaeological knowledge is unstable (Hicks 2013) – as if, as Bergson put it for science and philosophy, they were 'meant to implement each other' (Bergson 1965 [1922]: 5). And third, a close examination of *Time* in Archaeology and Photography questions ideas of perceptions of short moments of time in the instant and the snapshot, and thus constellations of these as 'multi-temporality' (cf. Hicks 2016). If the camera is 'a clock for seeing', as Barthes has it (1980: 33), then we might take the time to listen to 'the living sound of the wood' beyond the instant, in the swing, one tick after another.

*

A generation ago, when the idea of *Archaeology and Photography* emerged in the avant-garde 'post-processual' work, it was a metaphor for the sociology of archaeological knowledge. The metaphor has since developed into a dominant trope in the archaeotheory of the Representational Archaeology. Photography represented one vehicle, with the veneer of French theory, now Foucauldian, now Barthesian, through which this sociological critique of the archaeological construction of knowledge of the past in the present could be developed:

> 'Photographs in archaeological texts usually offer either pictorial atmosphere or act as documentary witnesses. The witness says 'I was there'; the photo says 'Look and see'. But looking is not innocent. The eye of the camera, the look with perspective is often the gaze of surveillance, the one-way look… It belongs with an attitude which would take the past, appropriate the past, pin it down. Mug shots of the past. Inventories. The atmosphere shot may also speak of the restrained immediacy or spectacle of tourism. The act of looking goes with the meanings it finds. Surveillance finds objects to control' (Shanks 1992: 145-6).

This was an explicitly 'critical' sociocultural approach to the knowledge practices of Archaeology as a discipline:

> 'Photographs are often taken for granted in archaeology. They are treated as technical aids, helping to record or identify features and objects, or they may provide illustrative ambience, landscape backdrop, evocations of setting. There is little or no questioning of conventional uses of photography. Archaeological photographs are treated as transparent windows to what they are meant to represent. I aim to inspect this apparent clarity. Taking direction from cultural studies… and from the sociology of knowledge… my perspective is one of critique, looking within cultural works to reveal sedimented meanings which serve particular interests: it is a negative outlook, aiming, through rational scrutiny, to unveil and debunk neat systems of method and thought, on the grounds that they are always inadequate to reality' (Shanks 1997: 73).

Gradually over the past quarter of a century, this constructivist position has hardened. For example:

> 'A successful account of the past,' it is suggested, 'is not so much a measure of accordance between the way things were and our archaeological account, as it is a personal and social achievement' (Shanks 2007: 589-90, 591).

The metaphor of the photograph and the artefact as traces of the past has become 'the ontology of the past—that it did happen' (*ibid.*: 591-2). Archaeology is redefined as 'a field of archaeological work performed upon the material past that persists into the present, involving (media) representations made of the remains of the past' (Shanks and Witmore 2012), reduced to the study of the remains of the past in the present in 'a conjunctive moment of past/present' (Shanks and Svabo 2013: 100). Archaeology is reduced, in other words, to a subfield of classical reception studies dealing with material culture rather than texts (cf. Hicks 2010). The influence of this work has been felt across studies of the archaeological record (Lucas 2012, Carabott *et al.* 2015, Doane 2002: 1, Bohrer 2011: 9).

There are doubtless many problems with how archaeological photography has been practiced: the formulaic manner in which photographs are set up and taken on an archaeological site, again and again, serving to flatten out the past through a particular form of visualism (cf. Guha 2002, Lyons *et al.* 2005, Morgan 2016), the monumentalization of sites where the 'clutter' of the archaeological process and the human lives that occupied the space within the frame are cleaned up and erased before the shutter is opened (Hamilakis 2008; Bohrer 2011; Hamilakis and Ifantidis 2013, 2016), the objectification of fieldworkers who are included in the frame (Knight 2000; Baird 2011; Riggs 2016), to name but a few. But attempts to develop alternative photographic practices in archaeology, from 'photo documentaries of theatres of excavation (Shanks 1992: 184) or 'photo-essays' (Hamilakis and Ifantidis 2013, 2016) to the myriad photographic forms of collaboration between Art and Archaeology, have been of varied success. Such work does not help, and can actively distract

from, the problems and the potential of that immense ongoing project of quotidian archaeological practices of creating photographic archives (Baird and McFadyen 2014), those millions of images that fill the museums just as artefacts do, and which archaeologists speak of 'depositing' as if they were not ruins or remnants but new stratigraphic horizons of sediment and fill. When archaeologists speak in these contexts of Photography as documentation, preservation or recording, the Representational Archaeology has taken this at face value, focusing just on interpretation or critique in retrospect as if it were an alternative that could be placed into the slot formerly occupied by explanation. As if the Archaeology were a readymade, or at least already done by others, and our task is only criticism (neither literary, nor Marxist, but simply negative). But this book is filled with archaeologists who do Archaeology (including taking photographs).

Instead, let us recall that the Barthesian punctum was not simply a contemporary moment of interpretation, but 'a roll of the dice' – a form of chance (*hasard*) that can 'bruise and grab' the viewer (Barthes 1980: 49)[iv]. Our alternative view is to understand Photography not as representation but as transformation, and to find hope in renewing its potential in Archaeology not to perpetuate but to make 'trouble' for civilisation:

> 'To see oneself (other than in a mirror): on the scale of History, this act is recent, the portrait, painted, drawn, or miniaturized, having been, until the diffusion of Photography, a restricted good, destined moreover to display a social and financial standing – and in any case, a painted portrait, however close the resemblance (this is what I am trying to prove) is not a photograph. It is curious that no one has thought of the trouble (for civilization) that this new act causes. I want a History of Looking' (Barthes 1980: 28) [v]

*

On 6 April 1922 at the at the Société française de philosophie in Paris, Albert Einstein and Henri Bergson debated the implications of relativity for conceptions of time and simultaneity. Einstein argued for a distinction between physical time (measured speed) and psychological time (slower human consciousness of measured time). Bergson's position was that measured speed, no matter how fast its capture, is always derivative in that it requires a spatial translation of time, and that this creates a purely immobile form of movement. 'What is real is the continual change of form', Bergson suggested: 'form is only a snapshot view of transition' (Bergson 1911 [1907]: 319). Time as instant, in this view, is illusory—it is a representation, just as form in photography is represented as static:

> 'It is true that if we had to do with photographs alone, however much we might look at them, we should never see them animated: with immobility set beside immobility, even endlessly, we could never make movement' (Bergson *ibid.*: 322)

Our conception of Archaeology and Photography has remained within an Einsteinian sense of spacetime, imagining that differences in elapsed time are created through the photographic image or the archaeological artefact, in an extreme example of time dilation. The photographic image arrests duration, it is assumed, as a method for standing outside of ongoing, living processes of constant change. For Bergson, this is a fallacy:

> 'A science that considers, one after the other, undivided periods of duration, sees nothing but phases succeeding phases, forms replacing forms; it is content with a qualitative description of objects, which it likens to organized beings. But when we seek to know what happens within one of these periods, at any moment of time, we are aiming at something entirely different.' (Bergson *ibid.*: 351).

How can we use Bergson's account of 'the language of transformism' to describe image and object in Archaeology and Photography as more than a still life? How can we invert the idea of unchanging, instantaneous, frozen remnants that multiply time, by understanding these instead as ongoing resources in human life through which time is transformed? Bergson again:

> 'Continuity of change, preservation of the past in the present, real duration—the living being seems, then, to share these attributes with consciousness. Can we go further and say that life, like conscious activity, is invention, is unceasing creation?' (Bergson *ibid.*: 24)

It is by recalling the status of Archaeology and Photography as modalities of *knowledge* that we can start to acknowledge the durational, and thus transformational, qualities of images and objects, as distinct from the dogma of representational (instantaneous) accounts that are hooked on the rhetoric of the snapshot and the freeze-frame. Such an approach inverts Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge*, which was based on the idea of 'discourse…immobilized in fragments, precarious splinters of eternity':

> 'There is nothing one can do about it: several eternities succeeding one another, a play of fixed images disappearing in turn, do not constitute either movement, time or history' (Foucault 1972 [1971]: 166; cf. Canales 2009: 181).

Visual Anthropology, and specifically the work of Elizabeth Edwards (see 2009, 2017), is one place where the idea of photography as duration has been developed. Edwards writes about the ways in which the photographic image involves many events and processes (Baird 2011, 2017). This is more than simply asserting that the photograph is some kind of object, or the idea that Visual Anthropology has witnessed some kind of 'material turn' (*pace* Carabott et al. 2015: 11). It is about photographs as knowledge that endures. Elizabeth Edwards has argued that, 'Photographs here are as much "to think with" as they are empirical, evidential inscriptions' (Edwards 2001: 2). We agree.

Look at the photographs reproduced by the contributors to this book. One is taken in 1930-31 at Dura-Europos, Syria (*Figure 4.10*). Another taken in 2011 at Porto de Moura 2, Portugal (*Figure 6.1*). Both document an archaeological excavation, and are stored in the project's archive. They depict landscapes, spoil heaps, people and equipment. In Portugal the archaeologists continue to work whilst the photograph is taken while in Syria they have stopped work (the people sit and stand) during the time of the photograph. The ongoing movements elide with Sergio Gomes' account of 'practices through which redistributions take place' (Chapter 6). He argues that the archaeological photograph holds within it ongoing movements, he asks us to play with the light in the photograph and grasp a new direction in the materialization process. In the relative fixity of the Syrian site, Jen Baird (Chapter 4) notes the shadow over the archaeological remains in the trenches. Precisely because of the photograph, its fixity and shadow, she extends her thinking onto the subject of human relationships on an archaeological site. Who is present as an archaeologist? Who is present in the past?

Archaeological photographs of inscriptions remind us that they are more than just traces. Baird reproduces a series of four photographs of an inscribed altar from Dura-Europos, taken between 1931 and 2011 (*Figure 4.8*). Compare these with the two photographs taken in 1925 of the Brodgar Stone in Orkney, Scotland discussed by Antonia Thomas (*Figures 7.1* and *7.2*). Baird notes the shift in concerns, with focus on the inscription over the altar itself. Thomas notes that because the first photograph had the incised decoration chalked in, there is a lasting concern with the incised marks (inscription) over other decoration (pecked, ground and drilled cup marks) or the qualities of the dressed stone itself. For Thomas, the first photograph has set the standard for what is 'actually seen', and she charts the duration and effects of this view. Both authors note the power of the photography of inscriptions in archaeology to construct a singular knowledge of the past, which collapses our readings of text/art and object/architecture. So too with the different forms of modern inscription seen in Alex Hale and Iain Anderson's discussion of modern graffiti at Pollphail in Argyll (*Figures 9.2* and *9.3*). The drawing and writing documented in these photographs are more than just traces, and so are the inner connecting wall of the room where sacks of threshed grain are filled, and the space above and on in the inner side of the mill door. These images are busy with occupation, and so is the one taken by Philippa Elliott of the room keys on the wall at the reception at Pollphail (*Figure 9.5*). Where Hale and Anderson show how photographic images can redefine how we think about the significance of archaeological sites within Scotland's historic environment, Jim Dixon's discussion of informal photographic archives of a building in the process of transformation - two terraces of late 18th century housing either side of a public house in the London Borough of Southwark (*Figures 8.3* and *8.4*) - expands our sense of inscription by showing photography's ability to do more than record remnants or ruins in purely nonhuman form. The focus here is human life over time through architectural space. Photographs, artefacts, inscriptions, architecture: all here are ongoing spaces of building inhabitation rather than frozen ruins reconstructed in the present.

There is still more humanity in the photographs of people, and photographs of photographs. Thomas discusses a photograph of the first image of the Brodgar Stone taken in 1925, held in 2011 in the hand of the son of the man who took it (*Figure 7.6*). Thomas argues that that both Archaeology and Photography engage with and create multiple durations, and that this image is a kind of multi-durational object. Meanwhile Sam Derbyshire reproduces his photograph of copies of photographs taken in Turkana in 1930 in the hands of elders from the Nakurio community in 2014 (*Figure 10.7*). People are sitting, leaning and standing, whilst others are walking into and out of the frame, looking in different directions, looking at photographs, looking at the camera. 'This is not a still' – as Hicks argues in relation to his photograph of crayons held by a rubber band at the site of the Calais "Jungle" in 2016 (*Figure 2.5*). These images are what Mark Knight and Lesley McFadyen in their chapter call 'moving zones', in relation to their photograph of a Bronze Age eel trap in river silts at the site of Must

Farm (*Figure 3.7*). They are not ruins, remnants or traces or frozen moments of time, but animate durations, like any other part of the built environment, full of human life and thought that endures.

*

The chapters in the rest of this volume address the themes of *Archives, Time* and *Objectivity* in a series of different ways. To frame the rest of the chapters, in Chapter 2 Dan Hicks re-assesses the potential of the idea of *Archaeology and Photography*. Taking stock of the idea the dominance of sociological and 'symmetrical' accounts of photographs as constructions of scientific knowledge, Hicks argues that the idea of 'archaeography' has served to render Archaeology and Photography as metaphors for each other, reasserting the foundational logic of the Representational Archaeology of the 1980s: that archaeology does not discover the past but interprets the past in the present. Approaching the relationship between Archaeology and Photography as a kind of 'identifying with' rather than 'comparing to', Hicks draws upon discussions of photography in the later lectures of Roland Barthes, especially *La préparation du roman* and *Comment vivre ensemble* (Barthes 2002, 2003), theoretical approaches from Visual Anthropology and the long history of photographic writing in European cultural studies, and new thinking about socio-digital photography, to introduce the idea of '*Photology*' – the visual knowledge of the past that emerges through Archaeology, and 'in which to see is not to reflect (contemplate, interpret, represent) but to refract (transform)'. Understanding Archaeology as a form of knowledge in which the act of making things visible is central, Dan presents five 'mythologies' to explore this idea of photological knowledge, on the themes of *Homonymy, Prefiguration, the Unhistorical, Impermanence, and Appearance*. These mythologies work through a series of close readings of archaeological photographs, including an X-Ray, an artistic work by Indigenous artist Christian Thompson, a rediscovery of a photograph of himself excavating during the early 1990s. The chapter concludes by imagining a 'Transformation of Visual Archaeology' that involves a kind of 'Archaeology as if Photography' – in the place of the contemplative archaeographic interpretation of nonhuman ruins and traces, he imagines Visual Archaeology as a deeply human method for transforming our knowledge of the world.

Lesley McFadyen and Mark Knight address the theme of duration in Chapter 3, from Victorian photography to the photography of archaeological remains at the Must Farm excavations in Cambridgeshire, and to contemporary art. Informed by the work of Henri Bergson, they work through ideas of 'concrete duration', clock time, movement, 'illuminated points' and 'moving zones'. Inverting the idea that Archaeology and Photography share a concern with absence, they explore the ongoing presences in archaeological remains and photographic images. The blur of long exposure times represents human life and movement, as they show in a close reading of 'Bell Street, from High Street' (*Figure 3.6a*), a carbon print of a calotype photograph by Thomas Annan from the 1860s or 1870s. They call for archaeologists to 'slow down', so that they can attend to duration and the animate in archaeology's images and objects.

Jen Baird (Chapter 4) discusses an archive of excavations at Dura-Europos on the Syrian Euphrates made by Maurice Pillet in the 1920s and now held at Yale University. She uses this archival material to ask, 'What do archaeological photographs reveal about the nature of archaeological time?' She understands the archaeological photograph not just as documentation, but as a transformation of time, creating both time and timelessness. Discussing William Fox Talbot's photograph of the Entrance Gateway to the Queen's College, Oxford in *The Pencil of Nature* (1844), which reveals that it is around 2.40 in the afternoon (*Figure 1.2*), Baird discusses other kinds of unexpected consequences in photography, such as the inclusion of a shadow that reveals the photographer. We have reproduced one such image as the cover to this book – the shadow of archaeologist Richard Atkinson, and his camera, taking a photo of an archaeological excavation at Dorchester in the 1940s (*Figure 1.3*). But Baird also discusses the use of the body for scale and the politics of representation of the bodies of site workers. The humanity of archaeological photographs seen over time is clear: 'a photograph intended in the 1920s to be of an inscription might now be of an archaeological worker', she observes. Photography creates, rather than just documents, archaeological sites, Baird concludes, and the slow and

considered tasks of the study of archaeological archives represent a crucial practice for the transforming archaeological knowledge, intervening with temporal change, and engaging the politics of the visual representation of the past.

Since 2011, Joana Alves-Ferreira has been taking Polaroid photographs during her excavation work at Castanheiro do Vento, Portugal. In Chapter 5, she explains how this work, experimenting through Archaeology with the idea of the 'instant' photo that brings image and object together in time and space, seeks to transform our conventional sense of objectivity and subjectivity. She introduces the idea of 'parafiction', creating new combinations of the fictional and the documentary – combinations that move beyond the work of the Representational Archaeology, which has served to reduce fact to fiction through the idea of constructivism – and documenting the future as much as imagining the past. She concludes that the Polaroid photograph can be understood as a form that thinks - opening up the possibilities of a speculative visual archaeology.

In Chapter 6 Sergio Gomes explores Archaeology and Photography through the idea of 'poetics'. He observes how photographs from 2011 of an excavation at Porto de Moura 2, a prehistoric site located in Southern Alentejo in southern Portugal show nothing of the 'messy and muddy' detail of excavation. Through a discussion of Foucault's account of *The life of infamous men* (1979), he argues that the photographs 'code, frame, translate and communicate experience' and thus can be understood as 'textual spaces' that 'redistribute what is seen and what is unseen'. João Barrento's account of poetry as a powerful tool for making 'notes on what is happening in a given moment at a given place', Gomes understands archaeological photographs, like words, as techniques for making 'sudden memories of the world that create the conditions for change and transformation'. Archaeological photographs are textual, in this view, in that they translate the past.

In Chapter 7, Antonia Thomas examines the idea of 'multiple durations' through the example of the first photograph of the Brodgar Stone, a Neolithic carved stone discovered in Orkney in 1925. Following a discussion of some of the ways in which Archaeology and Photography have been discussed in the past, Thomas describes a sequence of photographic and drawn representations of the Stone, from 1925 to 2005, in each of which slight differences and changes emerge. The act of chalking in the incised marks, made visible for the camera, served to distract from the pecked and ground marks that are also key elements of its prehistoric decoration. This sequence cannot be understood through a conventional archeological account of chronology and 'snapshots' in time, Thomas argues. A discussion of the philosophy of time, from Bergson and McTaggart to Husserl and Alfred Gell leads into an account of how 'archaeology's visual conventions still produce, and perpetuate, a particular conception of time'. Both Archaeology and Photography, Thomas argues, 'create multiple durations', and in her account of the contemporary social dimensions of the Stone she shows how these include subjectivity, memory and humanity.

James Dixon, in Chapter 8, considers four different photographic records of a building undergoing redevelopment in Southwark, London. The different photographic archives range from the formal images of a professional architectural photographer to archaeologists' working shots, images used by the building contractors, and photos taken by artists who used the space for a temporary exhibition while it was empty. Dixon underlines how the archaeological study of buildings has long moved away from an interest only in original architectural intentions, to accommodate more historical and anthropological concerns with the ongoing use and biography of a building over time, the way in which photographs are taken in archaeology has remained focused on ideas of the earliest traces. He shows how a new approach to photographing buildings might accommodate ongoing lived human space – an observation that might also lead us away from seeing photographs as

frozen relics of an original past, and towards an interest in their ongoing human durations or 'living record'.

The built environment is also the focus of Chapter 9, in which Alex Hale and Iain Anderson consider the photographic recording of graffiti at two contrasting sites in Scotland - Scalan, which is a 19th-century farm and Catholic seminary in the Cairngorms, and Pollphail, which is a 1970s oil workers village on the west coast of Argyll. The former is the site of a significant body of 19th- and 20th-century informal graffiti made during everyday life at the site, while the latter was the location of a body of graffiti art made by the arts collective Agents of Change, which became a popular destination for 'ruin tourists' between 2009 and 2016. Their interest includes how these visual media relate both to definitions of the significance of these modern sites, and to the methods and practices of photographic recording. They discuss the challenge of recording everyday graffiti on buildings rather than just the original function of buildings, and they identify a commonality between this and the sharing of images of the Pollphail graffiti online, though which non-professional forms of photography can come actively to transform a historic site. Here, a permeability develops between Archaeology and Photography, in which taking a photograph can be compared with inscribing graffiti on a wall, and where archaeological approaches to the built environment can be extended, as suggested by Dixon in Chapter 8, to the visual environment of photography.

Sam Derbyshire expands the book's interest in time in Chapter 10 by considering the problem of ideas of historicity and contemporaneity, on a western model, in the context of eastern Africa. He brings a distinctively archaeological perspective, developing Elizabeth Edwards' injunction to 'focus on the detail' ('Edwards 2001: 2), to the field of 'visual repatriation' and 'photo-elicitation' as it has been developed in Visual Anthropology, through an account of research he has conducted in the Turkana region of northern Kenya with historic photographic collections from the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, including photographs taken by Ernest Emley and Wilfred Thesiger. He underlines photography's role, alongside the study of human evolution in the region, in the illusion of Turkana as timeless. Through interviews with Turkana people, he uses the photographs to create new histories of Turkana society, examining not just the images' materiality but what he calls their 'magnetism' – a key element in which the work of visual archaeology represents an intervention in social life. Derbyshire concludes that archival collections of photographs can be used, through an archaeological approach to the recent past, to 'engage with the histories of small-scale societies in rural, non-industrialized locations where the material remains of the past are otherwise uncommonly found'.

In the final chapter of the book, Oscar Aldred considers the potential of the archaeological aerial photography – a kind of image in which physical distance, paradoxically, increases what can be seen of the past (Chapter 11). Ranging from the pioneering air photography of O.G.S. Crawford to new digital technologies and the contemporary ubiquity of the aerial image in everyday visual culture, Aldred suggests that the aerial view represents a unique mode of visualism based on the 'accumulation' of actions and times in the landscape, in which the photograph itself operates like another layer of landscape change and time-depth (cf. Hicks and McAtackney 2007). He points out that sites visible as crop marks come and go from visibility according to the season the weather, the growth of plants, light and the time of day, and so on, so that aerial photographs are repeated again and again by archaeologists, sites alternately coming in and out of vision. Refuting the distinction between modern technology and landscape phenomenology, or between the experience of places on foot or from an aircraft, he draws our attention to the 'ecology' of practices through which these images emerge, and how they transform the world. In Aldred's view, Archaeology is like photography in reverse, in that it takes the time to reveal the layered durations of past times. As visual technologies of the aerial view continually advance, 'we

can only imagine', he suggests, 'the transformation in the structures of feeling, and the politics of privacy and surveillance, in how we perceive the world from above that such 'archaeological' and aerial developments will bring'.

*

Our hope for this volume is that it will contribute to the emergence of a new kind of Visual Archaeology – a body of literature of the same kind of sophistication and cross-disciplinary significance as has developed in the best work in Visual Anthropology (Edwards 2017, Edwards and Morton 2015, Joseph and Mauuarin 2018, Mirzoeff 2011, Pink 2013, Pinney 2011). In the historical study of archaeological photography, there is already a new generation of exciting and innovative work emerging, for example in the work of scholars like Jen Baird, Mirjam Brusius and Christina Riggs (Baird 2017, Brusius 2016, Riggs forthcoming). But as long as Archaeology remains held back by the legacy of the use of the archaeo-theoretical idea of Photography as nothing but an analogy, its use as a rationale for the focus of the Representational Archaeology on the trace, the remnant, the nonhuman ruin, received in the present, then this new project cannot begin.

Against the Representational account of Archaeography – where dereliction tourism meets classical reception theory via Latourian constructivism – we offer the notion the Photological as a way of focusing our attention on the visualism of archaeological knowledge. Where photography was reduced to a metaphor, not just in Archaeology since the 1990s but across cultural studies in the 1980s, we want to reclaim it as a key element of archaeological method and practice. Seven of the eleven chapters in this book are about photographs that were taken by the authors. This is book filled with practitioners and their collaborators – that kind of Archaeology that you simply cannot do on your own. Just as Fenton's image shows a different kind of Archaeology from that of Atkinson (*Figures 1.1* and *1.3*), so this book understands Photography not as an analogy but as a tool.

In archaeological practice, in its photographic practice, there is a constant engagement with others' lives and an ability to expand the notion of what a photograph can be (cf. Squiers 2014: 10). Perhaps this is why there are as many (if not more) 'working shots' as formal photographs in archaeological archives? In this same light, although the active creation of alternative photographic practices in archaeology are important, there is also the importance of what is right in front of our eyes (Batchen 2014), what is already there in archaeological practice and in its photographic archives past and present.

Those three themes again. To understand the past photologically requires us to ditch that depressing nonhuman 'artefactualism' of ruins and remnants and to find new accounts of *Objectivity*, to give up on the rhetorical idea of the past as contemporary and develop more thoughtful accounts of *Time*, and to focus on the camera as intimately related to the *Archive* as a device.

The contributions to this volume are united in an understanding of the archaeological object not as a frozen moment of time but an ongoing human duration, extended through these technologies of the archive and the camera. There is an affinity with Elizabeth Edward's notion of 'accumulative histories' (Edwards 2001: 13), but a challenge to expand this to accommodate the kind of slow processes of sedimentation that prehistory records, ongoing into the present. Each chapter has extended this observation to the question of photography in a different way: photographs understood as if they were buildings, as if they were people, as if they were memories, as if they were in motion, as if they were a part of oneself, as if they were politics, as if they were community history, as if they were salvage, above all as if they were transformations rather the representations or interpretations. (This is, as Dan's chapter puts it, Archaeology 'as if' Photography – another reading of Barthes that imagines a speculative alternative to the archaeographic *'ça-a-été'.*)

In the 19th century, we suggest, Photography as a technology made Archaeology as we understand it today possible. That is the lesson of Fox Talbot's Oxford clock-tower (*Figure 1.2*). But as Photography itself transforms today, becomes a form of language, a new

digital mode of visual knowledge (Hicks this volume), why should we turn to Archaeology? The socio-digital is surely an unexpected theme for a book about Archaeology.

But Archaeology studies change, and it studies the modern world, and it is a study of what is seen and what is unseen and what might be seen. How a different point of view emerges. It is a means through which we can discover and describe unspoken processes, present prehistories, that are going on around us all the time – unwritten, nonverbal even, and yet far from insignificant. And if 'language is the figure ground reversal of thought' in 'the embodiment of the visual image', as James Weiner has suggested in his discussion of Roy Wagner (Weiner 1995: 18, Wagner 1986), then a visual theory of knowledge might take a form nor unlike that that we are sketching for the Photological. And so beyond Archaeology, by showing how the archaeological metaphor of the remnant and the trace can be reoriented today, and how archaeological thinking about material culture is moving on from the old concerns of representation, we certainly hope that the book also makes a contribution to how we understand Photography. Michael Shanks was certainly right to observe that 'archaeology abounds in striking, strange and fascinating images' (Shanks 1992: 1). But our discipline is no antique cabinet of wonder today. It is full of new thinking that can not only change how we think about Archives, about Objectivity, about Time, and thus what *Archaeology and Photography* can mean today – but can also throw light on our socio-digital world of screens and devices, in which the ongoing collapse of event into image, object into subject, of the artificial into the real, of the everyday into the archived, and the interruption of timelines, and the power of making something visible, and the visualism of knowledge, all of this, is strangely familiar to the archaeologist.

With the advent of digital technologies, it is surely improbable, but of course also not impossible, that Archaeology – of all the disciplines! – might be a tool for understanding what the photographic image is today. So let us think ourselves towards an unfolding of visual knowledge that begins with a change of perspective, a transformative Augenblick, a figure ground reversal – *from Archaeography to Photology*.

References

Baird, J.A. 2011. Photographing Dura-Europos, 1928–1937: An Archaeology of the Archive. *American Journal of Archaeology* 115(3): 427–446.

Baird, J.A. 2017. Framing the Past: Situating the Archaeological in Photographs. *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 26(2): 165-186.

Baird, J. A. and L. McFadyen. 2014. "Towards an Archaeology of Archaeological Archives." Archaeological Review from Cambridge 29(2): 14–32.

Barthes, R. 1961. Le message photographique. *Communications* 1: 127-138.

Barthes, R. 1980. *La Chambre claire.* Paris, Seuil/Gallimard.

Barthes, R. 2002. *Comment vivre ensemble: simulations romanesques de quelques espaces quotidiens: notes de cours et de séminaires au Collège de France, 1976-1977* (edited by C. Coste). Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Barthes, R. 2003. *La préparation du roman, I et II: cours et séminaires au Collège de France, 1978-1979 et 1979-1980* (edited by N. Léger). Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Batchen, G. 2014. Photography: an art of the real. In C. Squires and G. Batchen (eds) *What is a Photograph?* Prestel: New York, pp. 47-62.

Bergson 1911 [1907]. *Creative Evolution* (trans. A. Mitchell). London: Macmillan.

Brusius, M. 2016. Photography's Fits and Starts: The Search for Antiquity and its Image in Victorian Britain. *History of Photography* 40(3): 250-266.

Bergson, H. 1965 [1922]. *Duration and Simultaneity* (trans. L. Jacobson). New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Carabott, P., Y. Hamilakis and E. Papargyriou 2015. Capturing the eternal light: photography and Greece, photography of Greece. In P. Carabott, Y. Hamilakis and E. Papargyriou (eds) *Camera Graeca: Photographs, Narratives, Materialities*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 3-21.

Doane, M.A. 2003. The Emergence of Cinematic Time. Modernity, Contingency, the Archive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Dubois, P. 2016. Trace-Image to Fiction-Image: The unfolding of Theories of Photography from the '80s to the Present. *October* 158: 155-166.

Edwards, E. 1999. Photographs as Objects of Memory. In M. Kwint, C. Breward and L. Aynsley (eds) *Material Memories. Design and Evocation*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 221-236

Edwards, E. 2017. Anthropology and Photography. In T. Sheehan (ed.) *Grove Guide to Photography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 127-132.

Edwards, E. and C. Morton 2015. Between art and information: towards a collecting history of photographs. In E. Edwards and C. Morton (eds) *Photographs, Museums, Collections*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 3-23.

Foucault, M. 1972 [1971]. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (trans. *A. M. Sheridan Smith).* London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. 1979. The Life of Infamous Men (trans. P. Foss and M. Morris). In M. Morris and P. Patton (eds) *Michel Foucault. Power, Truth, Strategy*. Sydney: Feral Publications, pp. 76-91.

Guha, S. 2002 The visual in archaeology: photographic representation of archaeological practice in British India. *Antiquity* 76, 93-100.

Hamilakis, Y. & F. Ifantidis, 2013. The other Acropolises: Multi-temporality and the persistence of the past. In P. Graves- Brown, R. Harrison and A. Piccini (eds) *The Oxford Handbook on the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 758-781.

Hamilakis, Y. and Ifantidis, F. 2016. *Camera, Calaureia: An Archaeological Photo-ethnography* Oxford: Archaeopress.

Hicks, D., 2003, Archaeology unfolding: diversity and the loss of isolation. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22(3): 315–329.

Hicks, D., 2010. The material-cultural turn: event and effect. In: D. Hicks and M.C. Beaudry (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25–98.

Hicks, D., 2013. Four-field anthropology: charter myths and time warps from St Louis to Oxford. *Current Anthropology* 54(6): 753–763.

Hicks, D. 2016. The temporality of the landscape revisited. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 49(1): 5-22.

Hicks, D. and M.C. Beaudry 2006. Introduction: the place of historical archaeology. In D. Hicks and M.C. Beaudry (eds) *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-9.

Hicks, D., and M.C. Beaudry 2010. Material culture studies: a reactionary view. In: D. Hicks and M.C. Beaudry (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-24.

Hicks, D. and L. McAtackney 2007. Landscapes as standpoints. In D. Hicks, L. McAtackney and G. Fairclough (eds) *Envisioning landscape: situations and standpoints in archaeology and heritage.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press (One World Archaeology), pp. 13–29.

Joseph, C. and A. Mauuarin 2018. Introduction. L'anthropologie face à ses images. *Gradhiva* 27: 4-29.

Knight, M. 2000. Camera Obscura: Archaeology and Photography. Unpublished paper presented at Garrod Research Seminar, McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Cambridge.

Krauss, R. 1999. Reinventing the Medium. *Critical Inquiry* 25(2): 289-305.

Lucas, G. 2012. *Understanding the Archaeological Record.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, C., J.K. Papadopoulos L.S. Stewart and A. Szegedy-Maszak 2005. *Antiquity and Photography: early views of ancient Mediterranean sites.* Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Mirzoeff, N. 2011. *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Morgan, C. 2016. Analog to Digital: Transitions in Theory and Practice in Archaeological Photography at Çatalhöyük. *Internet Archaeology* 42. http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue42/7/index.html

Pink, S. 2013. *Doing visual ethnography.* London: Sage.

Pinney, C. 1992. Parallel histories of anthropology and photography. In E. Edwards (ed.) *Anthropology and Photography, 1860-1920.* New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 74-95.

Pinney, C. 2011. *Photography and Anthropology*. London: Reaktion.

Riggs, C. 2016. Shouldering the past: Photography, archaeology, and collective effort at the tomb of Tutankhamun. *History of Science* 55(3): 336-363.

Riggs, C. forthcoming Photographing Tutankhamun: archaeology, ancient Egypt and the archive. London: Bloomsbury.

Shanks, M. 1992. *Experiencing the Past.* London: Routledge.

Shanks, M. 1997. Photography and Archaeology. In B.L. Molyneaux (ed.) *The Cultural Life of Images: visual representation in archaeology.* London: Routledge, pp. 73-107.

Shanks, M. and C. Svabo 2013. Archaeology and photography: a pragmatology. In A. González Ruibal (ed.) *Reclaiming Archaeology: Beyond the Tropes of Modernity*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 89-102.

Shanks, M. and C. Witmore 2012. Archaeology 2.0? Review of Archaeology 2.0: New Approaches to Communication and Collaboration [Web Book]. *Internet Archaeology* 32. https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.32.7

Squires, C. 2014. What is a photograph? In C. Squires and G. Batchen (eds) *What is a Photograph?* Prestel: New York, pp. 1-46.

Wagner, R. 1986. *Symbols that Stand for Themselves.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Weiner, J.F. 1995. *The Lost Drum: the myth of sexuality in Papua New Guinea and Beyond.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

[i] 'une stase étrange, l'essence même d'un arrêt' (Barthes 1980: 142); 'Le noème de la Photographie est simple, banal; aucune profondeur: *ça-a-été* (Barthes 1980: 176).

[ii] 'Le second élément vient casser (ou scander) le studium. Cette fois, ce n'est pas moi qui vais le chercher (comme j'investis de ma conscience souveraine le champ du studium), c'est lui qui part de la scène, comme une flèche, et vient me percer. Un mot existe en latin pour désigner cette blessure, cette piqûre, cette marque faite par un instrument pointu; ce mot m'irait d'autant mieux qu'il renvoie aussi à l'idée de ponctuation et que les photos dont je parle sont en effet comme ponctuées, parfois même mouchetées, de ces points sensibles; précisément, ces marques, ces blessures sont des points. Ce second élément qui vient déranger le studium, je l'appellerai donc punctum; car punctum, c'est aussi : piqûre, petit trou, petite tache, petite coupure — et aussi coup de dés. Le punctum d'une photo, c'est ce hasard qui, en elle, me point (mais aussi me meurtrit, me poigne).' (Barthes 1980: 48-49)

[iii] 'Quel est le contenu du message photographique ? Qu'est-ce que la photographie transmet ? Par définition, la scène elle-même, le réel littéral. De l'objet à son image, il y a certes une réduction : de proportion, de perspective et de couleur. Mais cette réduction n'est à aucun moment une transformation (au sens mathématique du terme)' (Barthes 1961: 128)

[iv] 'Ce second élément qui vient déranger le studium, je l'appellerai donc punctum; car punctum, c'est aussi: piqûre, petit trou, petite tache, petite coupure — et aussi coup de dés. Le punctum d'une photo, c'est ce hasard qui, en elle, me point (mais aussi me meurtrit, me poigne)' (Barthes 1980: 49).

[v] 'Se voir soi—même (autrement que dans un miroir) : à l'échelle de l'Histoire, cet acte est récent, le portrait, peint, dessiné ou miniaturisé, ayant été jusqu'à la diffusion de la Photographie un bien restreint, destiné d'ailleurs a afficher un standing financier et social — et de toute manière, un portrait peint, si ressemblant soit—il (c'est ce que je cherche à prouver), n'est pas une photographie. Il est curieux qu'on n'ait pas pensé au trouble (de civilisation) que cet acte nouveau apporte. Je voudrais une Histoire des Regards. (Barthes 1980: 28).